



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

WIDENER



HN S5Y1 2

C4228, 46, 11

**HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY**



**THE BEQUEST OF
EVERT JANSEN WENDELL
CLASS OF 1882
OF NEW YORK**

..

1918

For Mr. Green

A

NARRATIVE

OF THE

CONVERSION OF THE WRITER,

EDWARD LEAHEY,

FROM ROMANISM TO THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

THE REV. DR. BERG'S REVIEW OF THE PAMPHLET, AND
REV. JOHN G. WILSON'S REVIEW OF THE CONTRO-
VERSY BETWEEN DR. NEVIN, THE PRESIDENT
OF MARSHALL COLLEGE, PA., AND THE
SAID EDWARD LEAHEY. ALSO,
A POPIISH BULL, OR CURSE.

IN THE CONCLUSION OF THIS NARRATIVE IS TO BE FOUND "AN EXPLANATION
OF THE SCAPULAR, ITS ORIGIN, AND THE SOLIDITY OF THIS
DEVOTION;" TOGETHER WITH A TABULAR VIEW OF
THE SOVEREIGNS OF EUROPE, WITH THE
TIMES OF THEIR ACCESSION.

PHILADELPHIA :

BARRETT & JONES, PRINTERS, 31 CARTER'S ALLEY.

1846.

*Presented by the Author
to C. P. Bassett*
a NARRATIVE

OF THE

CONVERSION OF THE WRITER,

EDWARD LEAHEY,

FROM ROMANISM TO THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

THE REV. DR. BERG'S REVIEW OF THE PAMPHLET, AND
REV. JOHN G. WILSON'S REVIEW OF THE CONTRO-
VERSY BETWEEN DR. NEVIN, THE PRESIDENT
OF MARSHALL COLLEGE, PA., AND THE
SAID EDWARD LEAHEY. ALSO,
A POPISH BULL, OR CURSE.

IN THE CONCLUSION OF THIS NARRATIVE IS TO BE FOUND "AN EXPLANATION
OF THE SCAPULAR, ITS ORIGIN, AND THE SOLIDITY OF THIS
DEVOTION;" TOGETHER WITH A TABULAR VIEW OF
THE SOVEREIGNS OF EUROPE, WITH THE
TIMES OF THEIR ACCESSION.

PHILADELPHIA :

**BARRETT & JONES, PRINTERS, 34 CARTER'S ALLEY,
1846.**

04228.46.11

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
FROM
THE BEQUEST OF
EVERT JANSEN WENDELL
1918

P R E F A C E .

In publishing the subsequent narrative of my conversion from Romanism to Christianity, I feel utterly unable to give expression to my feelings, when I reflect upon the deep importance of the subject which I am about to lay before the public. It is a subject which comes home to the "business and the bosoms" of mankind. It is not confined to me as the individual concerned ; it visits every circle, from the highest to the lowest, it alarms the very heart of the community, and interests all the friends of humanity and religion.

In the first place, my object is to show the reader the motives by which I am actuated in abjuring the tenets of the Church of Rome.

Secondly, I will prove Mr. Mullan, a Popish priest of New Orleans, to have been guilty of perjury ; this charge I will sustain by publishing a letter written by Athans. Ford, Esq., and signed by several gentlemen of Philadelphia ; also by publishing the certificate of my marriage, which he (priest Mullan) swore I had forged.

Thirdly, and lastly, I will show the ungenerous, unjustifiable, and unmerited treatment Priest Mullan has, without offence or provocation, inflicted upon me ; for which treatment, however, I shall ever feel grateful, as, in the providence of God, it has been the means of

disgusting me with the Romish faith, and leading me to the prayerful study of the word of God, and has thus (without his intention) brought me to the knowledge of the religion which I firmly believe was established by Jesus Christ for the salvation of all mankind.

EDWARD LEAHEY.

NARRATIVE.

I WAS born in Ireland, and brought up in the Roman Catholic religion. At about the age of thirteen, I left my native country and entered the Monastery of La Trappe, in France, where I remained subject to the vows and discipline of that fraternity, until it was disbanded by order of Louis Phillippe, King of the French, in the year A. D. 1832. I then returned to Ireland, and repenting of my Monastic vows, I took a journey to Rome, and petitioned the late Pope to release me from them. His Holiness, then, released me from my vows of celibacy, on condition that I would hereafter pay him \$3000!!! That was the sum which Father Kohlemann, a Jesuit, who was appointed by Cardinal Weld, to hear my confession, said I should pay into the vatican at Rome. My confessor also added, that, as in the sacrament of penance, there were three parts; so, also, in the dispensation which His Holiness was about to grant me there were three parts, namely: 1st. Confession in the ear of a priest; 2d. Absolution; 3d. Satisfaction, or penance performed by the penitent. So, said he, for your penance you must pay \$3000 to support the church, and then you will be fully released from your vows; but I have been so unsuccessful in business since then, that I am not as yet able to pay His Holiness, and I fear never will! Therefore I am still a Monk, and always will be, as I never intend to pay his Holiness one cent.

In testimony whereof, I insert a copy of the following letter:

† ROME, September 27th, 1834.

MY DEAR MR. LEAHEY:—I have the pleasure to inform you, that last night I received your *Dispensation*,

granted by H. H. Of this success I hasten to acquaint you by the first post. I shall keep the document, to give you the first time I have the pleasure to see you, and sincerely hope it will be for your happiness both in this world and the next. You will, no doubt, be anxious to see and have the advice of Father Kohlmann. He is now at Galora, near Albano, for his Villigatura; I have written to him, to tell him of your success with the Petition. Hoping you are quite recovered, and that I shall soon see you,

I remain your sincere well wisher,

(Signed) T. CARD. WELD.

Copied verbatim, literatim, et punctuatim.

I came to the United States in the year A. D. 1837, and on the 28th of June, 1838, in Philadelphia, I married an American lady in the fifteenth year of her age. In the fall of the same year we went to New Orleans, where I placed my young wife in the sacerdotal care of Priest Mullon and his relative SAINT Wale, who seduced her!!!

Enraged at the outrage, I sued the parties, and laid my damages at \$10,000; the case was tried in the First Judicial District Court of New Orleans, which trial occupied a full Jury from nine o'clock in the morning until four in the afternoon.

The Jury consisted of Roman Catholics, together with a Popish Judge at their head, and a Popish Priest as a witness, who gave me a verdict of six cents damages, for the seduction of her whom I promised to pay the Pope \$3000 for the privilege of marrying!—and yet; a Popish Jury, together with a Popish Judge, in AMERICA, only gave me six cents damages for her who cost me so much, independent of my journey to Rome. Their verdict was in strict accordance with the standard of Popish Theology, which says: "That a priest occupied in the ministry of hearing confessions, falls very seldom in comparison with the times he does not fall,"—and if he should "fall deliberately two or three

times a month, the confessor is bound to desert that ministry," but, if only once or twice a month, he may be esteemed as a tolerable good confessor.

You see, my dear readers, what severe and afflicting trials I had to encounter, not only from Popery but also from Puseyism, as I will now show you, by inserting here the Rev. John G. Wilson's review of the controversy between Dr. Nevin, the President of Marshall College, and your humble writer.

For the Methodist Protestant.

EDWARD LEAHEY,

FORMERLY MONK OF LA TRAPPE, IN FRANCE, AND LATE OF MARSHALL
COLLEGE, PENNSYLVANIA.

This brother, who has lately connected himself with the Methodist Protestant Church, was born in Ireland, and brought up in the Roman Catholic Religion. At the age of thirteen he left his native country and entered the Monastery of La Trappe, in France, where he remained, subject to the vows and discipline of that fraternity, until it was disbanded by order of Louis Phillippe; King of the French, in the year A. D. 1832. Leahey then returned to Ireland, and repenting of his Monastic vows, he took a journey to Rome, and petitioned the Pope to release him from them. Having succeeded in this, he came to the United States in the year A. D. 1837, still devoted to the interests of the Papacy. Five years afterwards, being grieved by the corruptions of Popery, his eyes were opened to its true character, and, renouncing it, he connected himself with the German Reformed Church, in Philadelphia, under the pastoral care of Dr. Berg. He was then sent to Marshall College, at Mercersburg, with the view of preparing for the ministry in the Reformed Church.

In 1844, intending a visit to Philadelphia, he received the following testimonial from Dr. Nevin :

No. 1.—“Mr. Edward Leahey has been connected as a student, with the institution, at this place, for two years. During the first year his studies were connected irregularly with the college; with the view of adding so much to his previous acquirements in the Roman Church, as might enable him to attend with advantage the course of education in the Theological Seminary. During the last year he has been a student of the Seminary, in which capacity he has attended the exercises in the Greek Testament, and passed over the course in Biblical Archæology and Biblical History, reaching from the creation to the time of Christ. He has recently entered on the study of Didactic Theology and Ecclesiastical History. This may certify that his standing in the institution is fair and good. So far as I have been able to observe he has conducted himself with uprightness all along. He has shown himself also serious and earnest in his religious feelings, and I have good trust that he has made progress in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. His studies, moreover, have been prosecuted with visible advantage and improvement; and the interest he seems to feel, particularly in Didactic Theology, furnishes a good ground to expect still larger improvement in time to come. Altogether, he is possessed of qualifications which, with further training, it is believed, may make him, under the blessing of God, a good minister of the Gospel.

“ J. W. NEVIN,

“ *Professor of Theology.*

“ *Mercersburg Dec. 5, 1844.*”

Some time prior to this date, Mr. W. Ramsey, now pastor of a Presbyterian Church, in Philadelphia, visited Mercersburg, and held a series of religious meetings there, during which such persons as felt inte-

rested for the salvation of their souls were invited to come to what was termed the anxious bench. To this measure Dr. Nevin was opposed, and Mr. Ramsey was also opposed on account of it. Dr. Nevin also published a book, entitled "The Anxious Bench," exhibiting his views and feelings on the subject. Mr. Leahey now received permission of Dr. Nevin to preach on his way to Philadelphia, and so began at Mercersburg, by preaching at once in the Methodist Episcopal Church, where a revival was then in progress. At this meeting several persons came forward to the mourner's bench, under conviction of sin, as subjects of prayer. The next day Mr. Leahey was brought to account for this offence, and straightly charged to preach no more for the Methodists. This occasioned the first difference between Dr. Nevin and himself, inasmuch as he from this time became favorable to the measure adopted by Mr. Ramsey.

Puseyism also began to develop itself in the Seminary about this time, and Mr. Leahey, on his visit to Philadelphia, made Dr. Berg acquainted with it. This led to a controversy between the Professor and Dr. Berg. Mr. Leahey appearing to favor the views of the Professors, as his letters show, was informed by Dr. Berg, in a letter dated May 1, 1845, that he, Dr. B., could no longer conscientiously sustain him in holding Dr. Nevin's views, which he believed to be "*pernicious errors*." This, in connection with other circumstances, induced Mr. Leahey to think of changing his ecclesiastical relation, and he paid a visit to Mr. Whittingham, Bishop of the Maryland Diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church, with this view. He obtained, also, to this end, the following testimonial from Dr. Nevin, by whose advice he acted:—

No. 2.—"At the request of Mr. Edward Leahey, I state that he is a member of the German Reformed Church, connected with the congregation of the Rev. Dr. Berg, in Philadelphia—at present in regular stand-

ing, prosecuting his studies in this place with a view to the holy ministry.

"J. W. NEVIN.

"*Mercersburg, July 24, 1845.*"

He soon found, however, that the terms of the Bishop were such, that he must virtually unchurch every other denomination except the Roman Catholic, in order to be a good churchman in the Bishop's estimation. To this he could not consent, and it led him to perceive that the tendencies of Puseyism were back to Popery. He was now convinced that it was what Dr. Berg styled it, a "pernicious error," and resolving at once to renounce it, he paid a visit to Bro. Jer. Mason, of Clear Spring, to make some inquiry into the doctrines and discipline of the Methodist Protestant Church. Having satisfied himself in relation thereto, he determined to unite with this denomination, and asked his dismissal from the Seminary, which was given as follows:—

No. 3.—"Mr. Edward Leahey came to this place in the fall of 1842. During one year he was employed in irregular studies, preparatory to entering the Theological Seminary. Since November, 1843, he has been a student of the Seminary. At his own request he is now dismissed from this institution, in regular standing, to pursue his course in such direction as the Lord may direct. His Church relation holds immediately with the First German Reformed congregation in Philadelphia, from which he brought no dismissal to this place.

"J. W. NEVIN,

"*Prof. of Theology in the Seminary of the*

"*German Reformed Church.*

"*Mercersburg, Aug. 18, 1845.*"

With these testimonials, and a certificate of his ordination in the Roman Church, he was received by the Quarterly Conference of Williamsport Circuit, as a

Deacon, and by that body recommended for the Itinerancy. A few weeks afterwards he came in company with Bro. E. Henkle, President of the Maryland District, and Bro. Rowen, of Jefferson Circuit, to Philadelphia, with the view of raising some money by lectures for the relief of the Jefferson Church, as well as to solicit the payment of subscriptions made for his support at Mercersburg, by members of Dr. Berg's congregation. To aid him in the latter object, Dr. Berg gave him the following testimonial :—

No. 4. "*Philadelphia, Sept. 19, 1845.*

"At the request of Mr. Leahey, I state, herewith, that I am satisfied with the expression of his views in relation to the matters in controversy between the Theological Professors, at Mercersburg, and those who believe the sentiments promulgated in the Seminary at that place to be contrary to sound doctrine. Mr. Leahey has no sympathy with the novelties which have of late found favor in the Reformed Church, and I hope and believe he will ever be found steadfast in the true Protestant faith. Those persons who have already subscribed towards his support, need be under no apprehension that their liberality will be misplaced or abused on account of Mr. Leahey's Theological views. He is at present connected with the Protestant Methodist Church, in which his prospects of usefulness are more favorable than they could be in the German Reformed connection.

"J. F. BERG."

Not meeting with the success he anticipated, he returned to Williamsport Circuit, where he labored with Bros. Morgan and Dumm until the close of the year, when he came to Philadelphia a second time, bringing with him the following testimonial :—

No. 5. "*Williamsport Circuit,*

"*Washington County, Md., Dec. 30, 1845.*

"We, the undersigned, do hereby certify, that Bro.

Edward Leahey has been acceptably engaged with us in ministerial labors since his resignation from the Theological Seminary, at Mercersburg, in the month of August last. He is now called upon to make a visit to Philadelphia, for the purpose of collecting funds to defray the balance of his expenses, due for his education at the above named Seminary of the German Reformed Church.

“JNO. MORGAN, *Supt. of W. C.*

“ROBT. WILSON, *Unstated Min.*”

Mr. Leahey not succeeding in this object, was on the point of returning to the Circuit, when an effectual door seemed providentially opened to him, wherein he might do good by exposing the errors and corruptions of Romanism, and, at the same time, be furnished with the means of support, as well as to liquidate some debts, above alluded to. It was hoped that he might rescue some of his former brethren from the trammels of Popery, and prevent others from being entrapped by its wiles. In these objects he has not been unsuccessful. Besides what may have been silently effected, at least one learned and intelligent gentleman openly renounced the Pope and the Devil, in the Methodist Protestant Church, in Attorney St., N. Y., and thousands have become better acquainted with the nature and character of the Mother of Harlots! In exposing the abominations of the Confessional, Mr. Leahey was obliged to quote from “*Dens’ Moral Theology*,” language unfit for a promiscuous assembly—and yet, obscene and polluting as it is, language which is addressed by the Romish priest to females in the Confessional. He, therefore, from prudence and delicacy, prohibited females and minors from attending on such occasions. This enraged the devotees of the man of sin, and excited the morbid sympathies of the pseudo Protestants, who, it appears, can tolerate the Confessional, vile and corrupting as it is, but cannot endure its exposure. They can suffer a malignant tumor to

threaten the very life of virtue, and spread its deadly gangrene over the social body, but cannot endure its being laid open by a surgeon, because of its offensive appearance. They strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel.

Accordingly, an article, signed "A PROTESTANT," appeared in the "Weekly Messenger," of the German Reformed Church, published in Chambersburg, and was republished in the "Presbyterian" and "Catholic Herald," of Philadelphia, with liberal comments, in which Mr. Leahey was censured for his "*revelations of the Confessional*." The writer says that the pamphlet published by Mr. Leahey consists of extracts from *Dens' Theology*, and is full of the "*vilest obscenity*:" and supposes the *revelations* of the Confessional, which females are not permitted to hear, to be worse still—and that he would much rather have his "children or friends go to a *theatre of the worst class*," than to listen to such an "*abominable rehearsal*." He also endeavored, by misrepresentation and falsehood, to discredit Mr. L.'s conversion from Popery, his connection with Marshall College, and his standing as a minister of the Gospel.

In reply to this anonymous attack, the writer of which; however, appears to be known, Mr. Leahey justifies his exposure of the Confessional, by showing that Dr. Nevin (who has some control over the Weekly Messenger,) had found it necessary to exclude the ladies of Mercersburg from some of his lectures, addressed to the students of the Seminary on the subject of certain "*vile practices*" which had crept in amongst them, and which, according to the logic of this zealous Protestant, ought to have passed unproved, because unfit to be rehearsed in the ears of ladies. Truly, it is not the bag itself with which this mawkish Protestant feels his moral sensibilities so offended, but merely the name of the thing. He could very probably permit a wife or daughter to go to the Confessional, knowing that their minds must be polluted, and most likely their

hearts corrupted by the "*vilest obscenity*," while he could not tolerate the mere rehearsal of it to an assembly of husbands and fathers, for the purpose of warning them of the danger to which their wives and daughters are exposed. We scarcely know whether such a man most deserves our pity or our scorn. And we wonder not that such a Protestant, (as Mr. Leahey states,) so far from having an abhorrence of theatres, "was detected some time ago in the upper department of Walnut Street Theatre, in company with nameless characters, and afterwards offered as his excuse, that he went from top to bottom to learn human nature." Mr. Leahey is now giving us the best evidence of the reality of his conversion from Popery: the certificates of Dr. Nevin show his connection with Marshall College, and he sustains the office of Deacon in the Church to which he belongs; and in this manner we dispose of the misrepresentations and falsehoods of a *Protestant*. (?)

The next attack upon Mr. Leahey was by Dr. Nevin himself, who being in Philadelphia at the time, published in the Sun, and Ledger, an article, in which he says, that "The first of these (certificates) was given in 1844, and expresses in moderate terms what I felt authorised to say to his benefit *at that time*. The second is a mere dismissal, affirming the fact of his *regular* standing, without the usual accompaniment of *good*—bearing date, August, 1845. His standing *regular* at the time. But it was felt that he was not called to enter the ministry, and he was told plainly that this was out of the question in the German Reformed Church. Hereupon he applied for a dismissal, which, of course, was granted. He then joined the Protestant Methodist Church, and from that body obtained such commission as he may now have to preach. Since that time the character of this man has so developed itself, as to make his case very clear to all who are acquainted with his life." Dr. Nevin then declares his want of confidence in him now, and characterise

his statements in relation to Marshall College as a scandalous perversion of facts.

Against this philippic Mr. Leahey quoted the language of the certificates given here, from which any one may see in what "*moderate terms*" the Doctor expresses himself in Mr. Leahey's favor. He also reiterated his statements in relation to certain "*vile practices*" among the students of the Seminary, which had occasioned the private lectures of the Doctor. He then quotes from one of his letters to Dr. Berg upon the subject, dated Aug. 5, 1844, in which he deploras the state of things, and says, "that the Christian conduct of the Theological students cannot bear a shadow of comparison with the piety and fraternal charity of the Monks of La Trappe." He then specified some of these "*vile practices*," and challenged Dr. Nevin to deny them, and invited him to attend his next lecture, and disprove, if he could, before the people, any one of his statements. The doctor took care, however, to do neither.

It is very evident that Dr. Nevin's last statement is a jesuitical *ruse*, to do discredit to Mr. Leahey's character and destroy his influence. In December, 1844, the Doctor, after two years acquaintance with Mr. Leahey, and opportunity of narrowly observing his deportment, felt authorised to express himself in the "*very moderate terms*" (!) of the certificate—No. 1. In July, 1845, only three weeks prior to Mr. Leahey's leaving the Seminary, Dr. Nevin certifies that he is a member of the German Reformed Church, then prosecuting his studies, "*with a view to the holy ministry*"—No. 2. Within that three weeks Mr. Leahey renounces Puseyism, and a change suddenly comes over the spirit of the Doctor's dream. It is now FELT that he is not called to the ministry, inasmuch as he will neither make a German Reformed Puseyite nor a Puseyite Churchman, and he is told so: a discovery Mr. Leahey had already made, and on account of which he now asked his dismissal, which Dr. Nevin

says was "*at his own request*"—No. 3. But then it did not please the Doctor to insert the "*usual accompaniment of good*," in addition to a declaration of Mr. Leahy's "*REGULAR standing*." I suppose by that we are to understand that a man who conducts himself "*with uprightness all along*," who is "*serious and earnest in his religious feelings*," and grows "*in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ*," is held in "*very moderate*" estimation, and may be in "*regular standing*" in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, but that to insure the "*usual accompaniment of good*," it is absolutely necessary that he be a PUSEYITE. Verily, Mr. Leahy may congratulate himself that he was only in "*regular standing*" at the time.

But Dr. Nevin says, that since Mr. Leahy joined the Methodist Protestant Church, his "character has so developed itself as to make his case very clear to all who are acquainted with his life." Very true, indeed, but in no wise to Mr. Leahy's discredit, as may be seen from certificates No. 4 and No. 5. It has developed itself in apposition to Popery and its Puseyite image. It is a clear case that he is a sincere convert from Romanism, a good man, and a devout Christian Protestant. He has passed through severe and peculiar trials, and maintained his integrity. He has escaped the pollution of a College and the trammels of Puseyism, and is now engaged in a work to which Providence seems to have qualified and called him, and in which I doubt not God will sustain him. He has just cause to abominate Popery and disclose its errors and corruptions.

His lectures, addressed to promiscuous assemblies, are delivered in respectful terms, and with evident good feelings towards his former Roman Catholic friends, whose conversion he sincerely desires. His "*Revelations of the Confessional*," from which females and minors are properly excluded, are unfit for a promiscuous assembly only on account of the obscenity of the interrogatories, &c. which, according to Dens'

Theology, are put by Romish Priests to females in the Confessional ; and, truly, "it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret." Yet, surely, if Priests must breathe such polluting and corrupting interrogatories into female ears in a private closet, how much rather may they be revealed to their husbands and fathers, in a salutary warning against their demoralizing and seducing tendencies ?

JOHN G. WILSON.

Kensington, May 6, 1846.

THE CONTRAST.

In order that our readers may have the whole subject fairly before them, we present in parallel columns the following extracts from *The Encyclical Letter, the Pope's Curse, the Bishop's Oath, John Hughes' Nine Propositions, and Mr. Kenrick's Card of March 12, 1844.*

Encyclical Letter.	The Curse.	The Bishop's Oath.	† John Hughes,	† Francis Patricek,
<p>"From that polluted fountain of 'indifference,' flows that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or the authority of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, and by our own—</p> <p>'liberty of conscience,' for which most pestilential error, the course sites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and apostates from the faith, attempting the overthrow of religion, and civil institutions, and which the unblushing impudence of some has held forth as</p>	<p>"In the name of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by the authority of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, and by our own—we excommunicate and anathematize, all Heretics, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and apostates from the faith, attempting the overthrow of religion, and civil institutions, and which the unblushing impudence of some has held forth as</p>	<p>"I, N., Elect of the Church of N., shall be from this hour henceforward faithful and obedient to blessed Peter the Apostle, and to the Holy Roman Church, and to our Lord N. the Pope.</p> <p>* * * I shall assist them to retain and defend against any man whatsoever, the Roman Pope, and the privileges of St. Peter, without prejudice to my rank.</p> <p>* * I SHALL TAKE CARE TO PRESERVE, DEFEND,</p>	<p><i>Bishop of New York.</i> <i>Extracts from the "Nine Propositions."</i> <i>1st Proposition—</i> <i>"I have never in my life, done an action, or uttered a sentiment, tending to abridge any human being, of all or any of the rights of conscience, which I claim to enjoy myself, under the American constitution."</i> <i>5th Proposition—</i> <i>"In all my public life, I have never</i></p>	<p><i>Bishop of Philadelphia.</i> <i>Extracts from a card to the citizens of Philadelphia and the public generally.</i> <i>* * * "Catholics have not asked that the Bible be excluded from the Public Schools. * * * They desire that the Public Schools be preserved from all sectarian influence, and that education be conducted in a way that may enable ALL CITIZENS equally to share</i></p>

an advantage of religion." * * *
 "Hither tends that worst and never suffi-
 ciently to be execrated and detested liberty of the press, for the diffusion of all manner of writings, which some so loudly contend for, and so actively promote. We shudder, at the sight of the monstrous doctrines, or rather portentous errors, which crowd upon us in the shape of numberless volumes and pamphlets, small in size, but big with evils, which stalk forth in every direction, breathing a malediction which we deplore over the face of the earth."

is. And also their adherents, receivers, favourers, and generally, any defenders of them: with all who, without our authority, or that of the Apostolic See, knowingly read, or retain, or in any way, or from any cause publicly or privately, observe by others, the rules of the Holy Fathers, the decrees, ordinances, or dispositions, reservations, provisions, and mandates of the Apostolic See. ACCORDING TO MY ABILITY, I SHALL PURSUE AND IMPUGN HERETICS, SCHISMATICS, AND REBELS AGAINST OUR SAID LORD, or his successors, as aforesaid."

INCREASE, AND PROMOTE IN New York, I have the rights, honors, privileges and authority of the Holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope, and of his successors as aforesaid.* * *

6th Proposition—
 "I HAVE ALWAYS CONTENDED FOR THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE, FOR ALL MEN, AS UNIVERSALLY AS THEY ARE RECOGNIZED IN THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION."

WITH MY WHOLE STRENGTH I SHALL OBSERVE AND CAUSE TO BE OBSERVED BY OTHERS, the rules of the Holy Fathers, THE DECREES, ORDINANCES, OR DISPOSITIONS, RESERVATIONS, PROVISIONS, AND MANDATES OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE.

7th Proposition—
 "I have always preached that every denomination, Jews, Christians, Catholics, PROTESTANTS OF EVERY SECT AND SHADE WERE ALL ENTITLED TO THE ENTIRE ENJOYMENT OF THE FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE, WITHOUT LET OR HINDERANCE, from any other denomination—no matter how small their number or unpopular the doctrines they professed."

in its benefits, WITHOUT ANY VIOLENCE BEING OFFERED TO THEIR CONSCIENTIOUS CONVICTIONS.

* * * It is their sincere desire to cultivate peace and all the social charities with all their fellow citizens, AND TO LEAVE TO OTHERS, what they temperately ask for themselves—LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE."

† FRANCIS PATRICK,
 Bishop, Philada.
 Philad. March 12, 1844.

In June, 1846, I was invited by Dr. Brown and Brother E. W. Griswold, President of the Protestant Methodist Church, in the New York district, to preach and lecture during the summer and fall; I then willingly accepted their offer, and was preaching and lecturing on Romanism until Thursday, October 8th, 1846, when I was invited to lecture at Verplancks Point on the Hudson River, in Mr. Henry's Church. Accordingly, I went on the same day, in company with Mr. A. Tomkins and other Protestant gentlemen, but before I completed my lecture, the Irish rushed into the church and made prisoners, not only of myself, but also of Mr. Tomkins and his friends, who were determined, at the risk of their lives, to defend me. Then Mr. Tomkins addressed the meeting in the following language:

"Is it possible that American citizens should be prevented by Irish Roman Catholics, from assembling in a Protestant Church? What would you think if we, Protestants, were to go to your Roman Church, and break up your meeting and insult your Priest, and treat him as you now treat our Minister?" At that moment, the Irish mob shouted, 'Minister, the Devil, away with him! away with him!' I then sent a private messenger for Mr. Henry, who was absent from the church, and who has a great number of those Irish Papists employed upon his brickyard, thinking that he might control them by his respectable presence, and influence. Mr. Henry arrived in about fifteen minutes, and on his entrance into the church, an old lady exclaimed, 'here is Mr. Henry, and he will soon disperse them.' At that moment an Irish Papist stretched his clinched hand towards her, exclaimed, 'shut up, you good for nothing huzzy.' Then Mr. Henry (as nearly as I can recollect,) commenced in the following language: 'What! have you come here to break up this meeting, and to disturb peaceful citizens?' Then the Irish replied, 'what did that turncoat come here for, to preach against our Holy Religion?' Mr. Henry's answer was, 'Is your religion so bad that it cannot bear examination?' 'No

sir,' said the Irish, 'our religion is very Holy, and don't preach against any one.' 'I know better,' said Mr. Henry, 'your church is a persecuting church, and calls all other denominations heretics.' Then Mr. Henry asked Mr. Tomkins, 'what was his wish?' Mr. Tomkins' reply was, 'we are made prisoners by these Irishmen, and wish to be released.' Mr. Henry then took me by the arm, in company with Mr. Tomkins and other friends, in order to conduct me safely home to my lodgings. But on our way, the brutal Irish mob rushed upon us and struck me with a large stone upon the back, as I was linked with Mr. Henry, and left me unable to move, until Mr. Tomkins assisted me to a store close by, and from there to his own house, where I was attended by his family physician."

I give the above statement as a fact which cannot be contradicted, and in witness thereof, Mr. A. Tomkins signs his name.

AMBROSE TOMKINS,

PRIESTS IN NEW ORLEANS AND PHILADELPHIA.

Three months have nearly elapsed, since the publication of a pamphlet in this city containing developments of priestly iniquity, scarcely to be surpassed in atrocity by any details of crime, which could be selected from the darkest page of the history of Popish perfidy and falsehood in this country.

The writer comes out boldly with facts, and dates, and names, and with the manliness, which an honest conviction that truth and heaven are on his side, can alone inspire, publishes to the world his experience, and gives his reasons for renouncing a system of delusion and wickedness, beyond controversy, the most infamous, which Satan has ever invented! It is cause of thankfulness, that *one* soul has been brought to the fold of Christ, and rescued from the jaws of the wolves in sheep's clothing, who are preying upon the temporal and eternal happiness of their unsuspecting victims. So infatuated are the followers of Antichrist, that though they have the light of God's truth before them; though developments of their priests' iniquity, are constantly exposed to public view, and though the pages of history are full of similar details which are recorded for their instruction, yet they remain Papists still! So utterly blinded are they by the god of this world, that neither truth, nor reason, neither Scripture, nor their own bitter experience, can induce the multitude to obey the command of God, which bids them come out of Babylon, lest they be partakers of her sins, and receive of her plagues! Now the power of this strong delusion, which so manifestly binds them, is itself a striking illustration of the literal fulfilment of prophecy. The coming of that Wicked One, whose marks and character are portrayed so accurately, was to be *with all deceivableness*

of *unrighteousness* in them that perish. There is nothing, which a confirmed follower of Antichrist, whether priest or layman, hates with so determined and bitter a hatred, as the *truth*; and there is no vice to which he is more fatally addicted, than lying! This may appear a hard saying to those, who have never turned their attention to this subject, but we are sure that it is the result at which every candid and impartial mind must arrive, after carefully weighing the evidence. Popery is a system of *lying*. "Speaking lies in hypocrisy," is represented by the apostle Paul, in his first Epistle to Timothy, as a grand characteristic of the Great Apostacy, and most fearfully is the truth of his prediction exhibited in the annals of the Church of Rome. Evasion, equivocation, and duplicity, are virtues in her estimation, and the doctrine and practice of her priests, in this respect, are perfectly consistent. For an illustration in point, we refer to Mr. Leahey's narrative. As we have already remarked, three months have nearly elapsed, since its publication. Rumors of a coming refutation or contradiction have been rife, but not a word has been ventured in relation to it, by the official organ of the priests. The indignation and chagrin of the more bigotted among the laity have been vented in threats of violence, in heartless and barefaced slanders, and in one or two instances, in open assaults upon Mr. Leahey—but we repeat it, *not one single word, either of refutation or contradiction has been ventured*. We cannot, therefore, be charged either with indiscretion, or with eagerness to give premature credence to statements, which place the character of the papal priesthood in New Orleans, and also in Philadelphia, in a most unfavorable light, when we comment upon these statements as *facts*, and express our abhorrence of the meanness, and the shameful connivance at gross injustice, with which two of the Popish dignitaries of this city stand charged, and to which their silence gives consent.

Mr. Leahey gives a plain and simple history of the

outrage perpetrated upon his domestic peace ; upon this fact we have no desire to comment ; delicacy forbids it, and no good would accrue from it. One of the guilty parties, Patrick Wale, is said to be dead, and the other is no longer Mr. Leahey's wife, he having been legally divorced. We leave them both in the hands of God. But the New Orleans priests, and Francis Patrick Kenrick, and Felix Barbelin, of Philadelphia, are among the living, and in due time and order we have a word to say to them, and to the public, in relation to them !

In the first place, the reader of Mr. Leahey's narrative, will be struck with the fact, that it is an easy matter for adulterers to obtain absolution from a Popish priest. All they have to do, is to keep quiet like good *Catholics*, and "*Ego te absolvo*," pronounced over each of the parties with the proper intention, after due confession has been made, places them in a state of sinless purity ! A refusal to *be still*, when the priest commands silence, is a very great offence, as the blood, which the *Rev.* J. J. Mullon drew from his contumacious patient, by dint of apostolic kicks and knocks, abundantly proves ! Another important doctrine, which is left for the reader to infer is, that it is a much greater sin for a Papist to reveal the crimes of a holy priest, than it is to tell a falsehood. *Father Moneaut*, of New Orleans, refused to give Mr. Leahey absolution, unless he would retract all he had stated, *HOWEVER TRUE* ! In other words, he offered absolution from all sins and offences, whenever and wherever committed, *at the price of a lie*. We rejoice that our friend had courage to brave the anathema of his confessor, and to adhere to the truth, at all hazards, and when the influence which Popish superstition exerts upon the mind is taken into view, together with the fact that the writer of this narrative was born and educated in the Roman Church, and had been all his life time in circumstances which favored the growth of its delusions in his own mind, it certainly is matter for congratulation, that he was enabled to prefer the

truth to every other consideration. But to return. After fruitless efforts on the part of the priests of New Orleans, to intimidate or cajole Mr. Leahey into submission, and after all attempts to heal the breach between him and his spiritual advisers had failed, a suit in the criminal court brought the matter to an issue; and Patrick Wale was put on trial for the crime of which he had been guilty. Mr. Leahey produced the certificate of his marriage, signed by F. J. Barbelin; and Priest Mullon, in open court, swore that the certificate was a forgery, to the best of his knowledge and belief. Mr. Mullon also swore *point blank*, that a letter of recommendation in Mr. Leahey's possession, signed by Athan. Ford, Matthew Carey, Col. Roney, Counsellor Rice, and several other highly respectable citizens of Philadelphia, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, was also a counterfeit! These *oaths* procured a verdict of 6 cents damages for the plaintiff, and placed him in the humiliating position before the public, of having lived for two years with his reputed wife, without being lawfully married; besides implicating him in the charge of having forged his documents! Mr. Leahey then wrote to priest Barbelin, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, who had performed the marriage ceremony, requesting a duly authenticated copy of the certificate of his marriage, to be sent to him without delay. Need we enter into an argument, to prove that Mr. Barbelin was required, by every motive which common honesty, and the common feelings of humanity could present, to forward the document, which his injured friend had demanded? Mr. Barbelin had no right to delay, for a single hour, his compliance with such a request, especially when made under such circumstances! It was in his power to relieve Mr. Leahey from the painful embarrassment in which he had been placed, by the perjury of a false witness, and any man, whose heart was susceptible of honorable and benevolent feelings, would have hastened to afford that relief! But instead of this, Felix Barbelin sends a copy of Mr. Leahey's letter to his friend Mullon, in

New Orleans, and by this act, implicates himself in the guilt of that wretched man! In place of an answer to his request, Mr. Leahey receives, by mail, a copy of the original letter which he had sent to the Philadelphia priest!

There was a Felix of old, who trembled, when Paul reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, but that Felix was not a Jesuit! Felix Barbelin has acted most unrighteously, and though he may escape the penalties of human retribution, and feel no concern respecting his future recompense, we warn him that there is a just God upon the throne, who has promised to avenge the oppressed, and who has always kept his word!

Francis Patrick Kenrick, who affects the modest title of "BISHOP OF PHILADELPHIA," is not less guilty than priest Barbelin; indeed we believe him to be the guiltier of the two. For although Mr. Barbelin, being a Jesuit, is not subject to the temporal jurisdiction of the Bishop, yet so long as he is in † Francis Patrick's Diocese, he is under his control in spiritual affairs. Mr. Kenrick refused to furnish his part of the document, until he saw that further resistance would involve him in an unpleasant collision with the civil authorities; and when the certificate was finally given, it came when the crisis was over, too late to effect the verdict of the court, though not too late to prove, by the testimony of priest Barbelin, that Mr. Mullan had sworn a false oath. All the apology that the Bishop of Arath and of Philadelphia has ever offered, for this flagitious breach of honor is, that *prudence* required him to take this course! Be it so. A higher motive requires, that we should expose his lordship's lamentable destitution of principles which honorable men admire.

But our classical readers must have an opportunity of seeing Mr. Barbelin's famous certificate, or at least a copy of it. We would suggest to the pious Rector of St. Joseph's Church, in connection with his lord bishop, the propriety of depositing a copy of it among the relics,

which enjoy their veneration. Its Ciceronian Latinity renders it worthy of preservation, and it might not be amiss, if Mr. Kenrick were to procure a special bull from His Holiness, *in perpetuam rei memoriam* ! The original certificate is in the possession of Mr. Leahey, and is as follows :

“ *Junius* (!) 28th, (!) 1838.

“ In matrimonium conjunxi Edwardus Leahey cum Catharina Dunleavy ; utrosque ex Philadelphia Testibus, Stephanus Breen et Catharina Gallagher.

“ F. J. BARBELIN,” S. J.

“ Taken verbatim from the record book of St. Joseph’s Church, Philadelphia, page 12.

“ Nov. 4th, 1840.

“ JNO. B. GILLESPIE.”

“ The above account is correct.

“ F. J. BARBELIN,” S. J.

Then follows a document signed Franciscus Patricius Kenrick, &c., setting forth in good Latin, (which, however, is bungled in Mr. Leahey’s pamphlet,) that Mr. Barbelin is worthy of belief in the aforesaid matter, but certifying nothing with respect to its grammatical accuracy. This is again endorsed by a document which bears the sign-manual and the seal of Mayor Swift, all in due form.

We commend Mr. Barbelin to the tuition of his lord bishop, and sincerely hope that his proficiency in the rudiments of Latin grammar, may be all that his learned teacher could desire. This erudite member of the Society of Jesuits, has involved himself in an unfortunate dilemma in relation to this very document. It is only a few weeks, since he testified positively, that the copy of the certificate, produced by Mr. Leahey, was **NOT** an accurate transcript of the original record, and yet the document in Mr. Leahey’s possession bears

Mr. Barbelin's own signature to a line written by his own hand, to wit:

"The above account is correct.

"F. J. BARBELIN," S. J.

Thus, the above record, with all its blunders, is endorsed by Mr. Barbelin, and he then solemnly declares that it is not correct; i. e. in other words, he avers that the account which he certified to be correct, is *not* correct. Thus we have Felix Barbelin in curia vs. Felix Barbelin in ecclesia, and in this beautiful predicament, we leave him to his own reflections!

Rev. Edward Leahy, formerly a Monk of La Trappe in France, and late of Marshall College Pennsylvania, connected himself with the Methodist Protestant Church in the month of August, 1845, as his testimonials certify. He has been acceptably engaged in preaching and lecturing on ROMANISM, in the New York Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church, since the first of July, 1846; and is now employed by us as a lecturer on Romanism. We therefore recommend him to the special care and fraternal protection of the ministers and brethren in our Conference, and also to all ministers and brethren in Christ, to whom he may deem proper to address himself.

Given this 21st day of October, 1846, at Jenkins' Cove.

ELIZUR W. GRISWOLD,

President of the New York District of the Methodist Protestant Church.

I cheerfully concur in the above recommendation.

WM. H. JOHNSON,

Pastor of Peekskill Circuit of the M. P. Church.

A copy verbatim, literatim et punctuatim.

SECOND EDITION.

A NARRATIVE.

When a soul is truly converted, it forsakes its evil ways; it feels itself secure in the hands of God, and dreads nothing but sin; and disregarding all things which have not a manifest tendency to the glory of God, and the propagation of the Gospel of the Blessed Redeemer, whose sacred blood alone washes away the sins of the world, its affections are expanded to imbibe all that is virtuous, and the door of its understanding is shut against the world, the flesh and the devil; its aspirations are heavenward, and the fruit of that soul is virtue, blessed by the affection she bears towards her God, the author of her conversion, who instils his Holy Spirit into her, and makes beauty beam on her, and thus she becomes the light of every Christian eye and the charm of every Christian heart. She moves along in the cloudless confidence of the full pardon of her sins, because she trusts alone for pardon to the blood of Christ, and to no other intercessor but her blessed Saviour, "the only mediator between God and man." What a process has the soul to pass through, that has imbibed the early impressions of superstitious, idolatrous Popery, before she can attain the peace and tranquility of the gospel!

What a variety of sufferings, what new scenes and changes must the soul experience, ere she can arrive to the peace and happiness which can never be found in the strict observance of the precepts of the Pope!

Truly may I say with the prophet David, "I cried to the Lord in my distress and he heard me." Deliver my soul, O Lord, from lying lips, and from a deceitful

tongue. What shall be given unto thee? or what shall be done unto thee, thou false tongue? Sharp arrows of the mighty, with coals of Juniper. Woe is me, that I sojourn in Mesech, that I dwell in the tents of Kedar? my soul hath long dwelt with him that hateth peace. "I am for peace; but when I speak, they are for war." Well may I apply this psalm to myself: well may I say that the Church of Rome has kept me sojourning in darkness, superstition and idolatry! But thou, O Lord, hast opened the eyes of my understanding by the sword of affliction—by the unjust persecution of false Roman ministers—by their hypocrisy concealed in the *sacred* tribunal of the confession! which I will now state as it occurred between me and my confessors, in order to show the reader that the confessional box is the door to sin—and the encouragement to guilt, facilitating the commission of crime by the unchristian and unlawful commands of imperious *Father confessors*, who have been the ruin of multitudes of souls.

Some short time after my marriage I was offered a lucrative situation as a clerk in New Orleans. Previous to my leaving Philadelphia, I procured without any difficulty, letters of introduction from some of our most respectable citizens addressed to several wealthy merchants in New Orleans. I was also introduced by letter from the Rev. Father Donaghue, pastor of St. Michael's Church, Philadelphia, to the Rev. J. J. Mullon—likewise to his religious relative Patrick Wale, chanter in St. Patrick's Church, New Orleans, and living as a monk observing celibacy, (that is to say, if we believe Priest Mullon's statement,) and a corresponding member of St. Joseph's Church, Philadelphia. One would think they had sacerdotal and sanctimonious epithets enough, without adding to them the criminal titles of adulterer and perjurer! Oh! unhappy introduction which has for ever separated her from me who was the darling of my affections.

My wife was young, beautiful, and of fascinating address, and so much so that she attracted the attention

of the Rev. J. J. Mullon and family. We were invited to their pew in St. Patrick's Church, we offered up our prayers together and received the sacraments from (as I then thought,) the holy hands of Priest Mullon: he was our confessor and spiritual protector. My feelings will not permit me to enter into prolix details, the mere recollection of which is painful in the extreme, and the recital of which would not be profitable to my reader. Suffice it to say, my wife was seduced by Patrick Wale, a relative of priest Mullon; seduced, I have every reason to believe, through the instrumentality of the confessional.

Enraged at the outrage, I sued the parties, and the case was tried in the first judicial district court of New Orleans, which trial occupied a full jury from nine o'clock in the morning until four in the afternoon; I have written an accurate account of it, but the details are such that modesty compels me to omit them. But I cannot pass over the flagitious conduct of Priest Mullon during the trial. He was called upon to come forth; the book of God was handed to him, which he professes to reverence, and not to profane; he trembled as I then thought with a holy awe, he kissed the sacred volume with his *anointed* lips, and swore that I forged a letter, signed by several gentlemen in Philadelphia, which letter I will publish in the subsequent part of this pamphlet. He swore that I forged Bishop Kenrick's signature and the certificate of my marriage. And thus, this perjured Priest Mullon achieved his unlawful design, proving my marriage to be null, in order to extricate his relative Patrick Wale from the penalty of the law.

But the iniquity of Mr. Mullon must be dated anterior to the trial. On a previous occasion, when painful suspicions had been excited, I went to that priest to confess my sins and get *absolution*.

I addressed him according to the usual custom, "Bless me Father for I have sinned." My first words were, "Father you and your relative have ruined me and destroyed my peace of mind and blasted for ever

my conjugal happiness!" *Confessor*.—"You must not say so, and if my relative has committed a fault, it is your duty as a Catholic to keep it private, and I will absolve all parties!" My reply was, "who will absolve yourself, for you are indirectly the instrument of my misfortune and the door by which my wife has been brought to such scandal—scandal which will for ever separate us?" *Confessor*.—"Do you say so?" My reply was "yes." *Confessor*.—"Well then take this;" at that moment he abruptly shut the little door of the confessional in my face. The next day his reverence met me near his own house, and as we passed each other he laid hold of me by the throat and knocked me down and kicked me with violence! Gentle reader, this is not a picture of the fancy, it literally occurred, and I refer you to the register of the first judicial district court of New Orleans in which it is now recorded.

As soon as my reason had become sufficiently collected, and I had cleansed myself from the blood which his sacerdotal hands had spilled, I went to Bishop Blanc, (of the city of New Orleans,) and showed him the wounds Priest Mullon had inflicted upon my person; I also stated to the Bishop that Priest Mullon would not give me nor my wife *absolution* on any other condition, except we promised not to mention the misconduct of all parties concerned. The Bishop told me to send my wife to confession, and that he would absolve her, or if she wished to confess to Father Moneaut, who lived with the Bishop, that he would absolve her. I sent the miserable and deluded woman the second time to confession, and the Rev. Father Moneaut heard her confession, gave her absolution, and sealed up her mouth from saying any more concerning Priest Mullon. When she returned home I asked her to tell me all that had passed between herself and her confessor; her reply to me was that she never would again tell me any thing that passed in confession; she also added that she had told me the whole of what passed between herself and Priest Mullon, (that is to say all that had passed in the confessional

box, but nothing of what occurred between them out of the confessional,) and that it had caused a great confusion between herself and her last confessor, Father Moneaut. Under such circumstances I made up my mind to choose Father Moneaut for my confessor, but at the same time I was fully determined not to let his reverence deceive me. On the Saturday subsequent to the trial, I went to confession to Priest Moneaut, and after the usual ceremony, I made a candid and full confession of all my sins: I also told him that I was innocent of the crime of which Priest Mullon had accused me; viz. of forging Bishop Kenrick's signature, also the certificate of my marriage, and the signatures of several gentlemen of Philadelphia.

I further added, that I had told several persons that I was innocent, and that Priest Mullon was guilty of perjury and public scandal, and that his reverence ought to retract his perjury and this would remove the public scandal he had given; here I was interrupted by my confessor, who said to me "stop! stop, you have gone too far, you have committed a mortal sin!" My reply was, "Father you are mistaken in your theology, I have not committed a *venial* sin, much less a *mortal* one!" *Confessor*, "You came here to teach me theology, did you?" "No father," said I, "but I came here to confess my sins, what will you have me do? Will you have me condemn myself without guilt? Will you have me say that Priest Mullon is innocent, and that I am guilty?" Here he very abruptly interrupted me by saying, "hold your peace—hold your peace, reply only yes or no until you leave the confessional; and listen to the advice which I now give to you as your confessor." My reply was, "Yes father I will." Then his reverence commenced as follows: "My dear child you are aware of the deep responsibilities which are peculiarly attached to the sacred tribunal of confession, and those responsibilities involve the confessor as well as the penitent, if he does not do his duty. Now my duty imperatively calls on me to make you restore Mr. Mullon's

good name, whether he is innocent or guilty, because he is a priest of the most high and just God, who will not suffer any person to utter words of detraction against his minister, and until you retract all you have stated, HOWEVER TRUE IT WAS, and restore him his good name, I will not give you absolution!" "Oh father! said I, will you have me retract that which cannot be retracted? If you do, you teach me to commit sin by telling falsehoods, by saying that Priest Mullon is innocent, for God knows he is guilty of swearing to a lie, inasmuch as he swore that I gave him the forged signature of Bishop Kenrick! Now said I, God sees that I am innocent, inasmuch as that I never gave Priest Mullon or any other person, lay or clerical, the signature of Bishop Kenrick, forged or unforge, therefore I am not guilty." Here my confessor asked me, did I know what detraction was? "Yes father," said I, "detraction is a secret staining and blotting another's good name, by making known, without just cause, his hidden sins and defects." His reverence's reply was, "according to your own statement you are guilty of detracting Mr. Mullon." "No," said I, "according to the law of justice, which calls on me to tell the truth in order to extricate myself, I am not guilty; nature herself loudly tells me that in this case, *charity begins at home!*" "Oh! my child," said his reverence, "you will not listen to my advice, you will have your own opinion in preference to mine, you will be dashed upon some rock or shoal, and wrecked like all other heretics, for," said he, "your very language is heretical and damnable! You may go, wicked child, I will not give you absolution until you recant." My reply was, "Father I will go, and you may keep your absolution, and give it to Priest Mullon the perjurer, and to his relative Wale, the adulterer, for I think they want it more than I do." *Confessor.*—"Your blasphemous expressions fully convince me that you are lost, and lost for ever, if you do not comply with my advice, which I give you as an imperative command; go, disobedient child, go, not in peace,

but in sorrow, sin, shame and scandal." "Father confessor," said I, "permit me to say a few more words before I go." His reverence's reply was, "Yes, but be brief." I commenced as follows: "Ghostly father; I am aware, that you are the representative of Jesus Christ. I am also aware that if I lie in confession, that I lie not to man but to God! and it is with fear that I call to mind the judgment of God upon Ananias and Saphira for lying to the Holy Ghost. Acts v. 5, 10: Now, ghostly father, if I lie to you may God in his justice do also to me as he has done to Ananias and Saphira; will you not now believe that I am innocent of the false calumnious charge which Priest Mullon has so maliciously sworn against me?" His reverence's reply was, "Yes, I am bound to believe you as my penitent, but I am also bound to compel you to speak well of Father Mullon and restore him his good name, by concealing his sin of perjury and publishing his merits." My reply was, "I promise you as my confessor that I will publish his (Priest Mullon's) merits as they are, verbatim, literatim et punctuatim." *Confessor*.—"Do you mean to say that you will publish the mistake which Father Mullon made; when he swore that you forged Bishop Kenrick's signature? My reply was "yes." *Confessor*.—"I forbid you to publish anything connected with Father Mullon or his family, if you do, you commit a mortal sin in the very act! and you will also commit mortal sins in proportion to the number of persons who will be scandalized by reading such a publication; although founded upon facts inseparably connected with truth, for the truth should not be told at all times, particularly when it involves the minister of Jesus Christ?" I then replied to his reverence, "Father I am sorry to give you so much trouble; I am also sorry that you are under the impression that I would sin mortally by publishing facts in order to extricate the innocent, and condemn the guilty! I have told you in the most solemn manner, that I am innocent, and that Priest Mullon is guilty of perjury, and his relative of adultery, and that

I felt justified in publishing the truth and nothing but the naked truth, and if it scandalizes the parties alluded to, they must be accountable." I further added, "Is it not written in the 15th chapter of St. John. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit he purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit?" Now the publishing of the hidden, as well as the notorious facts, which they have committed, will either purge them or else "cast them forth as the branches which shall wither, and they shall be gathered up and cast in the fire, and be burned." My confessor's reply was, "that he did not come to the confessional to be instructed or hear such scriptural arguments, but to instruct me, and absolve me from my sins, on condition that I would obey his imperative commands." His sacerdotal arguments prevailed—his threats and anathemas seized my trembling and deluded conscience, which erroneously told me that my irreverence would hereafter rise in judgment against me if I refused to comply with his sacred advice; under such afflicting circumstances, and actuated by simple and blind obedience, I thought it prudent to comply with my confessor's request. So I went home and destroyed my manuscript. This premature obedience on my part puts me to the painful necessity of writing it a second time. In eight days afterwards I went to the confession and related all I had done in thought, word and deed. My confessor asked me had I spoken well of Priest Mullon? My reply was, "as well as I possibly could without telling a lie." I also added that I had complied with his request by destroying my manuscript and that I hoped and trusted that he would not ask me to do any more, but give me absolution. His reverence's reply was, "there is something else wanting, and something of a very serious nature occurring daily on your part, and I cannot absolve you until you amend and retract." "Father," said I, "what do you mean?" *Confessor*.—"Have you not no later than yesterday evening met with one of our priests, and told him that

Father Mullon was a perjurer and a hypocrite?" My answer was, "yes," and I told nothing but the truth; would you have me to tell a lie?" I also added, that I was much astonished at the conduct of the priest who revealed that which I communicated to his reverence in the strictest confidence, and that I thought it sufficient for myself to confess my own sins without the aid of a second person, and particularly a priest, who ought to know better than to detract me without a just cause. Here I was interrupted by my confessor, who told me that the priest was not only justified, but also bound to reveal the secret which I had communicated to him in order to prevent me from speaking ill of Father Mullon. "Father," said I, "you allow *him*," (the priest who vindicated Father Mullon,) "a privilege which you will not allow me, nay, a greater privilege, because you will allow his reverence to vindicate Father Mullon, (however guilty,) and you will not allow me (however innocent,) to vindicate myself; I cannot and will not swallow such doctrine, and that which I swallowed the last time I was at confession with you, I have not as yet digested it, nor I fear never shall, and that I shall throw it out before the public." *Confessor*.—"You are a wicked man, and a blasphemer, and I will not give you absolution." My reply was, "Father, you may keep your absolution—you have shamefully tricked me, by making me destroy my manuscript, but please God if I live to go to Philadelphia, I will re-write it, and thus prove to the public, that inevitable danger of total and immediate destruction arises from the uncalled for and premature, nay, unchristian questions which are asked by imprudent father confessors, who drive their penitents to eternal destruction, and ruin for ever the peace of families by severing the sacred ties of connubial bliss, which just Heaven has commanded none should sunder! I further added, may God in his justice punish Priest Mullon the perjurer, and his relative Wale, the adulterer, for seducing my wife, and give me life and christian fortitude to publish their hypocrisy!"

Here I was interrupted by my confessor, who very abruptly shut the little door of the confessional in my face ; I was on my knees nearly an hour, and much harrassed at the long and painful task.

Let me ask the reader, (whether Catholic or Protestant,) not to condemn me for acting, (as he may suppose,) so irreverently in the confessional. Are we to tolerate doctrines that must necessarily torture our conscience, disturb our peace of mind, and irresistibly drive us into madness and despair, so as to render us unfit for any system of business? Are we to suffer bigotry or folly to fill our veins with fire, and kindle a fever that can be allayed only by death? In such a case let me ask the reader what would be our indispensable duty? I need not wait your reply, I give the answer myself. It would be, to avert such dreadful dangers by exposing the conduct of such father-confessors ; by holding up the folly of such bigotted and blind fanaticism to merited contempt: and painfully would we feel that on such an occasion we must dismiss all forms and ceremonies; and that to do our duty with effect we must do it without faltering.

It is my sincere desire to think and speak of those who have ruined my domestic bliss, in a spirit of forgiveness, but, at the same time, I cannot wholly forget what is due to myself.

I was called upon for my defence to meet a charge of forgery, (in the first judicial district court of New Orleans.) I was wrongfully and wilfully accused by the Rev. J. J. Mullan, the pastor of St. Patrick's Church; I acquitted myself honorably; and nature calls on me to communicate it to the public. Should my line of publication and defence not be agreeable to the Rev. Father Mullan, and family, it must be conceded that if they are entitled to act (as his reverence calls it) upon the PRINCIPLES OF PRUDENT CALCULATION, I have an equal right to be guided by a spirit of independence, and thus I take the legal privilege, first, of proving from theology, that Priest Mullan was, and is

still bound under the pain of mortal sin, to retract his perjury, and make public satisfaction; secondly, by publishing the document or certificate of my marriage, which Father Barbelin (of St. Joseph's Church, Philadelphia,) refused to send me, until my brother compelled him and Bishop Kenrick to give him the document which ex-Mayor Swift, Esq. signed and sealed. Third, and lastly, by publishing an exact copy of a letter which I wrote to the Catholic clergy in Philadelphia for the certificate of my marriage, and instead of complying with my lawful, and laudable request, by sending me the necessary document, or even answering my letter, they sent a copy of it to Priest Mullon in New Orleans, and he, or some other person for him, put another exact copy of it in the post office for me, and to my great astonishment, when I went there in quest of an answer, the clerk handed me a letter—here, said he, is a letter which was dropped in the post for you. With impatience, mingled with anticipated hopes of a favorable reply, I broke the seal, and found the genuine copy of the following letter.

New Orleans, August 14th, 1840.

REV. SIR :—

“Owing to the awkward predicament in which I am placed (through the misrepresentation of the Rev J. J. Mullon, pastor of St Patrick's Church,) I feel it necessary to appeal to your high and refined sense of natural and sacerdotal justice, by a brief and candid statement of facts, being convinced, that as a true and faithful minister of Jesus Christ, you are incapable of coming to any other decision in the affair but what is warranted by the principles of the natural and revealed law. By compliance with my lawful request, you will extricate me from that unsupportable load of calumny which the Rev J. J. Mullon has (on the 17th of June last, in the first judicial district court of New Orleans,) so unjustly impeached me with, in order to exonerate his relative

Patrick Wale, the adulterer, from the charge on which I had prosecuted him for seducing my wife. To be brief, the Rev. J. J. Mullan declared upon his oath, that I had presented to him the forged signature of the Bishop of Philadelphia; he also swore by his solemn oath that he knew not the certificate of my marriage written by your reverence, and that he believed it to be a forgery as well as that of Bishop Kenrick's. Thus the Rev. gentleman achieved his sanguine but unlawful designs, and proved my lawful married wife to be a prostitute, and that his relative, Patrick Wale, had as legal right to live with her as what I had. Rev. Sir, hear my solemn statement. I swear by the throne of Heaven, by the Holy Evangelists and the blood of my Redeemer, who will be my just judge the last day, and pronounce his irrevocable sentence upon me in proportion to the candid truth which I now solemnly declare to you as the minister of Jesus Christ; namely, that I never presented the signature of Bishop Kenrick, of Philadelphia, (forged, or unforged,) to the Rev. J. J. Mullan, or any other person, lay or clerical—permit me to add, by the same solemn oath, that I never asked Bishop Kenrick for his signature of recommendation; but I have had a recommendation from you, (Priest Barbelin) and two from the Rev. Father Donahue, pastor of St. Michael's Church, Philadelphia, one addressed to the Rev. J. J. Mullan, the other to his relative Patrick Wale, chanter in St Patrick's Church, also a correspondent member of St. Joseph's Church, Philadelphia. *"One would think he had epithets enough, without adding to them the title of adulterer."* Oh, unhappy introduction! which has for ever dissevered the sacred ties which heaven commanded none should separate! After this preface, I now take leave to come to the leading part of the subject of my letter; may I therefore express a hope, that you will, with as little delay as possible, forward to me by return of post the certificate of my marriage, signed by your Bishop and Mayor of Philadelphia, in order to prove

your legality, civil and sacerdotal : and thus you will prove my marriage to be valid, and also remove the false impressions which are now stamped on the minds of the citizens of New Orleans. Rev. Sir, if you do not comply with my lawful and laudable request, how can I extricate myself from the criminal charge which a second priest HOGAN in the PERSON OF PRIEST MUL-LON has accused me of? Or how can I repose confidence in the clergy at large, if a priest belonging to the strictest order of the Catholic church refuses to comply with my request, which is an imperative obligation on you? I will say no more for the present on this topic, but will conclude by recommending to your spiritual care and protection my unhappy and dissevered wife, who is now in Philadelphia.

“With the most profound respect and prompt obedience to your sacerdotal decision, I willingly submit and subscribe myself your humble servant,

“EDWARD LEAHEY

“Verbatim, literatim et punctuatim.”

P. S.—“In the hands of proper authority, and in due time, shall be investigated: other documents accompany from Philadelphia.” Direction of the above: the Rev. F. J. Barbelin, St. Joseph’s Church, or, in his absence, the Rev. Mr. Donahue, pastor of St. Michael’s Church, Philadelphia.”

As soon as I had perused the above letter, which is an exact copy of the one which I wrote for the certificate of my marriage, with the exception of the postscriptum, my determination yielded to a more prudent step, namely, to write a letter to my brother, and request of him to compel Bishop Kenrick, of Philadelphia, to give him the certificate of my marriage. Then the clergy had (not thanking him,) to yield compliance to my brother’s legal and imperative demands, and the necessary document (signed by Bishop Kenrick, Father Barbelin, and ex-Mayor Swift, Esq. all of Philadelphia,)

was forwarded to me in New Orleans, which document I have now in my possession, and shall use it as a shield in my own justification, and as a two-edged weapon to pierce the conscience of the Rev. J. J. Mullon at every blow, if, indeed, it be not already seared with a hot iron.

Here it is. I will give it to you in the original.

"Junius 28th, 1838.

"In matrimonium conjunxi Edwardus Leahey cum Catharina Dunleavy; utrosque ex Philadelphia Testibus, Stephanus Breen et Catharina Gallagher.

"F. J. BARBELIN."

"Taken verbatim from the record Book of St. Joseph's Church, page 12.

"Nov. 4th, 1840.

F. B. GILLESPIE."

"The above account is correct.

"F. J. BARBELIN."

"Omnibus quorum interest Nos Franciscus Patricius Kenrick Epus. Arath. et Coadjutor Epi. Philadelphinsis cum regiminis potestate notum facimus et testamur sacerdotem F. J. Barbelin qui supra recitato testimonio subscripsit dignum esse cui in prædictis fides habeatur. In quorum fidem manu nostra subscripsimus et sigillum nostrum opposuimus die.

"5 Novembris, anno 1840.

"FRANCISCUS PATRICIUS KENRICK,

"Epus. Arath. et Coadj. Ep. Phil.

*"United States of North America, }
City of Philadelphia." }*

"I, John Swift, Esq., Mayor and Chief Magistrate of the city of Philadelphia, do certify that Franciscus Patricius Kenrick, whose proper and genuine signature is subscribed to the foregoing certificate, is, and was at the date thereof, the Bishop of Arath and Coadjutor Bishop of Philadelphia.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the corporate seal of the city of Philadelphia to be affixed this fifth day of November, A. D. 1840.

“JOHN SWIFT, *Mayor*.

“Copy verbatim, literatim et punctuatim.”

I do not wish to comment upon the grammatical correctness of the classical writing of the secretary of Saint Joseph's Church ; namely, J. B. Gillespie. But let the classical critic, who reads the above Latin certificate, comment upon it.

But duty calls upon me to comment upon the uncalculated for conduct of the clergy of Philadelphia, or in other words, more applicable, the want of a sense of duty of the Catholic clergy of Philadelphia, who obstinately refused to send me the certificate of my marriage until they were in some measure compelled (when my letters would not prevail,) by my brother. In the first place I will give to the reader a clue by which to ascertain the motives which induced their reverences unlawfully to detain from me the certificate alluded to. Their HOLY brother-laborer in the vineyard, Priest Mullon, of New Orleans, had committed a crime of the blackest die, the perpetration of which, according to their sacerdotal doctrine, would in the very act expel, nay, excommunicate him (Priest Mullon,) from the church, and thus render him incapable of discharging his ministerial duties, and of course would scandalize the Papal church, by giving the Protestants, the mortal enemies of their religion, a weapon, nay, a two-edged sword, to cut not only the laity, but even the clergy. Now may I not reasonably suppose that they have argued thus amongst themselves, “Do you think that we, the *Catholic* clergy of Philadelphia, would have acted so prematurely, nay, foolishly, as to have sent that unfortunate but injured man the certificate of his marriage, at the crisis of his trial with our brother Priest Mullon? If we do send it to him,

(Edward Leahey, plaintiff,) will he not use the document as a shield in his own defence, and thus scandalize the worthy pastor of St. Patrick's Church in New Orleans?" I wish to inform the reader that I am perfectly aware what I say may be easily misconstrued; but if I be heard with candor equal to that with which I speak, I cannot be misunderstood.

I do not impeach the clergy of Philadelphia by saying that they have not sent me the certificate of my marriage, but I say that they did not send it to me until it was torn from their reverences by my brother Dennis Leahey. And I say that they have done me much injury in not sending me the certificate at the time it was called for by the jury of the first judicial court of New Orleans. The injury they have done me is apparent. If I had obtained the certificate of my marriage at the time of the trial, I should have refuted the false testimony of Priest Mullon, and proved him a perjurer, *just at the right time.*

Saint Thomas again teaches in his theology, that a priest is prohibited from absolving any penitent, lay or clerical, who has wilfully confirmed a falsehood by a positive oath, until the penitent makes, (if possible,) satisfaction; he also adds, if the perjury was public, the satisfaction must also be public. Peter Den's theology corroborates Saint Thomas' by saying that the penitent is bound to make amends for the injury inflicted, remove the bad results, and if some will still follow, he ought to prevent them. Now let me ask the reader has the Rev. J. J. Mullon retracted the false oath he has taken against me? No, he has not! Why so? "Because," says the Bishop, "he is a priest and at the head of a great congregation, and has done much in collecting money for the building of St. Patrick's Church; besides, if his reverence were to abjure the false oath he had taken, he would scandalize the church of Rome, and even if he did abjure, he was bound to make a public declaration of my innocence and his own guilt. By such a declaration he would do more injury than good,

therefore I must be resigned to the evil which God, in his providence has permitted to befall upon me by the hands of his minister." The above, or words similar, were the advice which Bishop Blanc of New Orleans gave me when I went to inform him of the unjust treatment I had received from the hands of Priest Mullon—he also added that Mr. Mullon told him that he was innocent inasmuch as that at the time he, (Priest Mullon,) swore against me, he was under the impression that his testimony was true. My reply to Bishop Blanc was, that on the supposition such were the impressions of priest Mullon at the time of his oath, that he was not thereby justified in refusing to retract when he afterwards learned that his previous oath was false, and that the canons of the church imperatively called upon him to restore me my character by abjuring his false oath, which was perjury in the first degree. Then the Bishop addressed me thus: "My dear child, what difference is it to you whether Priest Mullon has committed perjury in the first or second degree? He has to give an account hereafter, not to me, nor to you, but to the God of Justice, who will judge him according to the deeds he has committed; and as for you," (said he,) "bear it with patience and cast yourself on your knees before a crucifix, and approach the sacrament of confession, and thus you will restore peace to your soul by forgiving the *Lord's anointed*, and God will forgive you the sins of your life!" At that moment I cast myself upon my knees, and asked the Bishop's blessing. I then spoke as follows, "O eternal God! who knowest what is hidden, who knowest all things *even* before they come to pass, thou knowest that Priest Mullon has borne false witness against me; by swearing that I gave him the forged signature of Bishop Kenrick—by swearing that he did not know the signatures of the several merchants in Philadelphia, (whose letter I will publish presently, and lastly, by swearing that he did not know the certificate of my marriage." Here I was interrupted by the Bishop who told me to rise from my knees, and that

he believed my statement was true. "But," said he, "what will you have me do with Priest Mullan?" My reply was, "compel him to retract the false testimony he has borne against me, by making him publicly confess his guilt, and if he refuses to make such a confession suspend him." "Oh no!" said Bishop Blanc, "I will not suspend him nor will I make him, (Priest Mullan,) publicly confess his perjured guilt, because such a confession would scandalize the *Catholic* church!" "Well, my Lord," said I, will you permit me to publish his guilt in order to extricate myself from his false calumniating charges—the Bishop's reply was, "no—no, certainly not." Good bye, bishop Blanc, I want no more of your doctrine. Now let me ask you kind reader, with what justice, upon what principle of common sense, any priest, any Bishop, nay, even our HOLY FATHER THE POPE, could deny me the privilege of publishing facts founded on truth? Facts which will extricate the innocent and condemn the guilty! And in order to give you a full view of those facts, I will now publish the letter which caused so much noise and perjury in the first judicial district court of New Orleans, on 17th of June, 1840.

Philadelphia, September 17, 1838.

DEAR SIR :—I take the liberty of introducing to your acquaintance and kind notice the bearer, Mr. Edward Leahey, of whose excellent character, moral habits, superior acquirements, and business qualifications, I have the most favorable impression from my short acquaintance with him, and all of which appear fully confirmed by others who have known him longer, and in whom the utmost confidence may be placed.

Mr. Leahey visits your city in pursuit of business or employment, with a view to better his condition, believing the scope or field there to be so much greater than in this quarter, and I assure you, if you can and will

aid him in any manner in his laudable object, I shall feel with him personally obliged and always grateful.

Very truly your friend, and obedient servant,
ATHANS. FORD.

I concur in the above,

JOHN KEEFE,
STEPHEN E. RICE.

I unite in the recommendation of Mr. Leahey.

MATTHEW CAREY,
EUGÈNE CUMMISKEY.

I concur in the above recommendation of Mr. E Leahey.

C. M. GRIFFITHS,
THOS. RONEY.

With the within recommendation I willingly concur.
PHILIP SMITH.

Directions of the above letter,

CHARLES BIOREN, Esq. Merchant,
New Orleans.

On my arrival in New Orleans on the 3d of November, 1838, I called on the Rev. J. J. Mullon, and gave him a letter of recommendation which I had received from Father Donaghue, pastor of Saint Michael's, Philadelphia. I also presented to him, (Priest Mullon,) the original of the above letter, and asked his reverence if he could direct me to the residence of Charles Bioren, Esq.; he took the letter, and as it was not sealed, he opened it, and said with my permission he would read it, so when he had gratified his *religious* curiosity by reading it, he returned it to me, and I now most solemnly swear that you, Priest Mullon, told me on that day, (in your own house,) that you were well acquainted with Matthew Carey, Esq. and Philip Smith, Esq. both of this city. You, Priest Mullon, also told me that you

knew their signatures—their genuine signatures—and in the short space of seventh months, you, Sir, most solemnly swore that you did not know any of the above-mentioned signatures!

Oh! wretched man, you are a limb of “the Beast!” and I verily believe you have connived at the seduction of my poor wife from the paths which lead to the new and heavenly Jerusalem, and you have made her “to drink of the wine of Babylonish fornication.” And you, Sir, for the punishment of your sins, “shall also drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation, and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the sight of the holy angels and in the sight of the Lamb.” Your days are numbered, and the measure of your iniquities will soon be full; and then with this before you? I pity you—and I feel also for the great congregation of St. Patrick’s Church, (New Orleans,) which you are wilfully leading astray by your external and damnable hypocrisy. My dear Catholic reader, you must excuse me for telling you the truth, and for encouraging you to fly from him, and all like him, as you would from a lion in a wilderness, and climb up into the tree of knowledge by prayer and the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and thus you will come to the knowledge of that all-saving truth, and find peace to your soul. Let me entreat you, in the name of Heaven, in the name of that respect which nature loudly calls on you to have for your wives, daughters, and families—in the name and for the sake of your own peace of mind in this life, and your eternal peace and happiness in the next, to open the eyes of your understanding, and be not deceived by priest craft and lying hypocrisy which prevail in the Church of Rome. Cast, I beseech you, a glance to the Cathedral of Saint Patrick’s in New Orleans, and behold that perjured Priest Mullon still offering a *so-called* sacrifice in behalf of his congregation. Let me ask the Catholic reader, would he, or she, accept of his offering? Would you not risk your salvation at his hands? Would you not

fly to some other priest, and through his sacerdotal functions seek salvation? And if you found that priest, and all other priests and bishops you would call upon, still supporting Priest Mullon in his perjured and shameful guilt, would you not fly even to the Holy See of Rome, and through the *Pope, Christ's representative on earth*, seek out your salvation? But if the Pope commanded you to go back to Priest Mullon and be guided by him, would you acquiesce in his decision? would you not say to his holiness, how can I confess to a man who is perjured? If the Pope's reply was, as it most certainly would be, "I command you not to speak so irreverently of my priest. I commanded you to be guided by him, and your salvation is secure, and I will give you a plenary indulgence on condition you confess to Priest Mullon and do not expose him to the public! Here is a bull which will not only wash away all your sins but even root and horn out all the sins Priest Mullon has committed, as well as the perjury he has been guilty of against yourself! My bull will make you all as pure as if you never had sinned!" Would you believe his holiness? Would you swallow such doctrine? Would it not stop in your throat and choke you? Would you not say to his holiness to what distant region has the true Christian religion fled, when I cannot find it in the Church of Rome?

I am not ashamed to confess that there was a day when I was as bigotted a Papist as ever lived; but I thank God that he has given me a mind not quite impervious to conviction; and I thank the wicked and perjured Priest Mullon for affording me such convincing testimonies of the errors of Romanism.

It was priest Mullon and his unchristian treatment—his shameful perjury—his unmerciful blows inflicted on my person, and his base conduct in the confessional—in a word, it was his shameful crimes that first made me doubt the truth of the Popish religion: and thus his wickedness has been overruled by a kind Providence for my everlasting welfare.

God has made the wrath of man to praise him in the present instance. Priest Mullon's unprincipled conduct first drew my attention to the errors of the church of Rome; and the more I examined the word of God, the more full was my conviction that the Papal despotism is there portrayed as the great Apostacy, and the Mother of the abominations of the earth. But to proceed with my narrative.

I wandered from one priest to another until I had visited all the Romish clergy in New Orleans, and when I arrived in Philadelphia I confessed, in March last, to Priest Barbelin, and consulted with Bishop Kenrick, Priest Donaghue, and several other priests, all of whom seemed to condole with me, and expressed astonishment at the conduct of Priest Mullon. To be brief, I made up my mind to seek peace and happiness elsewhere, for I could not find it in the conversation and counsels of the Roman clergy, nor in the doctrines and practice of their church. I went one night to visit the Methodist Church in Christian street, and on my arrival at the door, there was a gentleman placed as a keeper, and he asked me for a ticket; my reply was, I had no ticket, and that I was a Roman Catholic, and wanted admission. "Well," said he, "you may go in." So I entered the Church of Ebenezer, and the congregation were all joining in a hymn of praise to God. They commenced their love feast, which deeply interested me, and I was fully convinced that the Spirit of God was with them. The Rev. P. Combe preached upon the love we ought to bear to one another, which sermon affected me so powerfully that I wept bitterly, and exclaimed, "God be merciful to me a sinner." I have become acquainted with many of the members of that persuasion, and have found them all, with one consent, holding fast the doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures, and walking in conformity to them.

I visited many of the churches in Philadelphia, and curiosity led me to hear the Rev. Joseph F. Berg, pastor of the First German Reformed Church of Philadel-

phia. His Lectures on Romanism, attracted my attention, and before I had a personal interview I went twice to hear him expose the errors of the Church of Rome.

One day I stepped into the Methodist Book Store in Fourth street, and asked the name of the pastor of the church above alluded to, (for at that time I did not know his name, although I had heard him preach,) and where he lived. I was informed, and called upon him, and introduced myself. He received me, not as Priest Mullon did, with a "blow—a knock down and kicking out,"—but with that charity spoken of by St. James, and with meekness and tenderness. After some conversation had passed between us, he asked me to dine with him, and I accepted his kind invitation. After dinner, he made me a present of some books, the perusal of which, by the blessing of God, has been of great service to me. And in this connection, I deem it my duty to state the following as part of the history of my conversation.

For some time after my mind had been impressed with a conviction that the Church of Rome was greatly in error, and subsequent to the commencement of my acquaintance with many of my recent friends, I was troubled in relation to several points of doctrine, and could with difficulty refrain from invoking the Virgin Mary and the Saints, and kissing my crucifix. It will not be thought strange that my early habits and training had so imbedded Popish prejudices and principles in my heart, as to render it difficult at once to break loose even from my grossest absurdities of that monstrous system of delusion and folly. In short, I adhered to transubstantiation, purgatory, the invocation of saints, &c. with a devotion worthy of a better faith; and though I was in doubt, I was not fully convinced of the unscriptural character of these and similar Popish tenets until after I had read Mr. Berg's Lectures on these topics, and his Synopsis of Den's Theology. Now I ask, am I not justified in abjuring those doctrines which are founded, not upon the Gospel of Christ but upon the tradition of Popery—doctrines which

never did, and never can impart peace to my soul, nor joy to my heart—doctrines which are surrounded by gloom and darkness? If a glimmering hope now and then appeared to the eye of my understanding, it was merely this—that by the strict observance of (as I then thought,) the unerring decrees and councils of the Church of Rome, I might at length be saved by passing twenty, thirty, or perhaps a hundred years in purgatory.

I am aware that the priests will pronounce an anathema against me in the very act of abjuring the errors of their apostate religion; (and if they could, they would brand me on the forehead, and pierce my tongue with a burning iron, as has too often been done in former ages.) But I disregard their threats and anathemas, and I fear them not; but I fear “Him who has power to kill both body and soul, and afterwards cast it into hell fire.” Yea, I repeat it, I fear HIM.

Yes, I say, Him alone will I fear; and I will, without fear of the Church of Rome, unfold Priest Mullon’s hidden hypocrisy, concealed under the cloak of religion, and the sacerdotal robes of sanctity. In conclusion, let me address you my Catholic and Protestant brethren. Truly may I apply that passage of Scripture to myself, which is written in the sixth chapter of St. John: “No man can come to me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day.” No, not all the power or art that human nature could invent would have had the desired effect if God had not stood at the gate of my heart and knocked. But he required a co-operation on my part, by opening the door of my heart and receiving his light into my bigotted conscience, in order to expel from it all the errors of Popery, before “he would come unto me, and sup with me and I with him.” God converts souls in different ways and by different means; but the general means he has given us are the preaching of his holy gospel and the reading of his unerring word, in connection with the dealings of his wise Providence.

I thank God that he has brought me to the knowledge of the religion which I most steadfastly believe was established by Christ and his apostles, and in the strict observance of which I hope to live and die. I have done for ever with Popish penances, and I cast myself upon the perfect righteousness of Christ as the ground of my acceptance with God. I have been a great sinner, but I trust God has been merciful to me. I expect to be saved through faith in Christ, and not by my own works. The faith by which I am now actuated is not blind obedience to an ignorant and infatuated "confessor;" it is a faith that works by love, producing obedience to God. Perhaps you may say to me that Christ did not command his apostles to give the Bible to the people, but to preach and expound it—and that your priests have done so, and will continue to do so to the end of the world. My reply is this, that I have heard them preach in Ireland, England, Scotland, France, and Rome, and now, in this land of liberty; and I do candidly confess, that I have never heard a priest, a bishop, or a pope preach the gospel as it is; that is to say, without blending up tradition with it, and thus accusing the Son of God of not perfecting the work which his Holy Father has commissioned him not to leave imperfect. "I have glorified Thee on earth; I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do;" John xvii. 4. Now, let me entreat of you again and again to search the Scriptures, and you will not find (in all the Sacred Writings, from the first chapter of Genesis, to the last chapter in the Apocalypses of St. John,) the doctrines and practices which the Church of Rome commands you, by imperative decrees, to pin to your sleeve; nay, to swallow them, however nauseous they may be to your taste, and injurious to the constitution of your soul and body.

I understand that Priest Mullon has sharpened his two-edged weapons in hopes of extricating himself from his sorrowful and shameful predicament, by the aid of

some of the clergy of Philadelphia, who have already engaged some of their penitents to vindicate priest Mullon. I would not make this statement were it not that I was positively told by a person who was once a friend of mine, (and for whose family I have done much by assisting them in a pecuniary way,) but who is now, according to her own statement, fully determined to extricate Priest Mullon, even by perjury. So much for the power of priestcraft by confession!

Let me ask the Roman clergy of Philadelphia to take a retrospective glance at the manner in which they treated me when I wrote to them for the certificate of my marriage, and will they not blush at the review of their conduct?

I can appeal to my former confessor, Father Barbelin, (pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Philadelphia,) to corroborate the following statement, namely, that I was a weekly communicant and a member of his confraternity, and passed for a moral and religious man, tenaciously adhering to the tenets of the Romish Church. I do not deny that subsequent to the unholy conspiracy of Wale and Priest Mullon against my domestic peace, I was no longer a weekly communicant, nor a member of their confraternity.

Notwithstanding the ungenerous and unjustifiable treatment I have received at the hands of the priests, I am not steeled by that treatment into an insensibility of the unhappy situation in which their unchristian conduct has placed themselves.

The Rev. J. J. Mullon, and his wretched associate must have felt before now, that they have inflicted incurable wounds upon their own reputation, and I will leave them to their own reflections, and shall try to pity and forgive them.

My Roman Catholic friends; if oaths are to be violated, laws disregarded, friendship betrayed, humanity trampled upon, individual honor stained, and if a community of husbands will give Popish priests a passport to their homes, and wives, and daughters,

farewell for ever to domestic happiness. I have every trust, and hope, and confidence that you will be on your guard. And to that hope I will add my most fervent prayer to the God of all truth and justice, that you may hate Popery with a perfect hatred! And thus you will preserve to yourselves while you live the most delightful of all recollections, that of acting justly, and to transmit to your wives and children the most precious of all inheritance, the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which is the destroyer of Popery!

EXTRACTS FROM THE SCAPULAR BOOK, SOLD AT THE
ORPHAN ASYLUM IN CHESTNUT ST., PHILA.

INSTRUCTION

FOR THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE SCAPULAR OF THE

MOST HOLY VIRGIN.

The Scapular—its origin, and the solidity of this devotion.

The little habit of our Lady of Mount Carmel, which is generally called the Scapular, is a mark of particular devotion, which many persons of both sexes are zealous to bear in honor of this glorious Virgin, and as a sign of their faithful endeavors to imitate her virtues. It ought to be made of wool, and be of the same color as the habit worn by the Carmelites. This institution originated in the piety of Saint Simon Stoch, who was general of the Carmelites in the thirteenth century: or rather it arose from the liberality of the blessed virgin herself, who to reward the fervor with which this pious general, for many years, demanded of her to honor his order with some special favor, appeared to him one day, surrounded by a great multitude of celestial spirits, holding in her hand a Scapular, and addressed him in these consoling words, "Receive, my beloved son, this Scapular, as the livery of the confraternity: it confers this privilege on you and all your brethren, namely, that none of the members of your confraternity shall suffer after death the flames of hell. It is a sign of salvation, a safeguard in danger, a token of peace and of an everlasting alliance." This

apparition is attested and confirmed by all that we could desire to establish the certainty of a vision. It is related by a great number of authors of established reputation, by members of the most celebrated universities—among others by those of Paris, and Salamanca, in Spain—it has been authorised by a great number of Bulls and Decrees which the Popes John XXII. Alexander V. Clement VI. Paul III. Gregory XIII. Paul V. Clement X. and others, have given in its favor; and in these decrees they have enriched the members of the confraternity with various privileges from the treasury of the church, as we shall see in the sequel. The church, as infallible in her doctrines as she is pure in her morals, has confirmed and approved this holy association, both by assigning a day to celebrate the feast of Mount Carmel, and also by the solemn office which she has instituted to commemorate this devotion. In fine, to leave no doubt as to the solidity of the devotion of the confraternity of the Scapular, and to confound the vain efforts of those who sought to decry it, it has been supported by the hand of God himself; for as miracles are the effects of almighty power they cannot be employed but to authorise the truth. Perchance such minds, influenced more by the spirit of criticism than of religion, jealous of seeing the holiness of the Scapular established by such solid proofs, will seek to render them suspicious. But the miracles wrought in favor of the Holy Scapular possess such a degree of evidence that there is no sincere person who would not be obliged to confess that it is the work of God. These miracles consist of various cases, with regard to which deception would be difficult—cases of persons *suddenly* healed from desperate and incurable maladies, and thus drawn from the very gates of Death—of others restored to life—of others saved from inevitable shipwreck, of others delivered from violent temptations which hurried them on to the gulf of despair. In one place this holy habit rendered those who bore it with the spirit of faith, invulnerable to arrows

and the blows of deadly weapons, and it was particularly a protection against fires. In another direction the greatest conflagrations have been arrested, and had no force against the holy Scapular, although it was surrounded by the flames on every side. Faithful relations may be found of all these wonders, such, for instance, as that of M. Bertholot, grand vicar of Sens, in his abridged history of the wonders of the holy Scapular. We subjoin a few well-attested instances in which God has manifested, even by miracles, how solid in itself, and conducive to salvation, is this devotion.

No. 1.—In the fourteenth century Spain was on the point of being completely laid desolate by a famine, which extended to every province, and bore heavily on all its inhabitants. It was about the time when our blessed Lady of Mount Carmel commenced to show her special protection towards those who wore the holy Scapular. A general procession was ordered to be made, in the midst of which the holy Scapular was carried as it were in triumph. Immediately the country saw abundance return, and gratitude and joy taking the place of the general distress which had but a little before prevailed. (*Pierre Lafitau, Bishop of Lysteron, p. 13.*)

No. 2.—In the 16th century the Island of Sicily was afflicted with a terrible drought. The heavens were closed as in the days of Elias; and sterility every where reigned, as in the time of Joseph, when the famine prevailed in Egypt, the aid of the Mother of God was invoked: the Scapular was publicly offered to the veneration of the people, and on a sudden the heavens, which before seemed of brass, poured down torrents of rain, and the people soon saw their granaries filled with abundance. (*Belsunce, Le Pere Chais. p. 43.*)

No. 3.—Louis XIII. when at the siege of Montpellier, in 1622, saw his friend Lord Beau-regard Champion receive a musket ball in his breast. The ball, after

having pierced his dress, flattened on meeting his Scapular, and did not inflict the least injury on his person or life. The whole army was witness to this fact, and the king, who himself beheld it, assumed the Scapular on the spot, and was registered at the head of the members of the confraternity. This miraculous fact is too well known, to require that we should cite any testimonies in its favor besides those of *Pierre Lafitau*, Bishop of Lysteron and of *Pere Theophile Raynaud*, a Jesuit, in his Treatise on the Scapular, chap. 6.

No. 4.—In 1652, at Bordeaux, a member of parliament, M. D'Indraut, was attacked by an assassin who fired on him with a pistol, but the Scapular which he wore with much piety and confidence in the blessed Virgin, delivered him from the danger in which he was. The ball with which he was struck flattened against his Scapular and he received no hurt from it. This wonderful occurrence was so public, that judicial information of it was sent to Rome by order of the general of the order of the Carmelites, and it was, moreover, published in the journals of the time. (See the Gazette of Paris, Nov. 4, 1652, Le Pere Pautier nouvelle instruction, p. 125.)

Could a kind providence recompense in a more striking manner, our faith and confidence in the intercession of his holy mother, or more openly declare himself in favor of the devotion of the holy Scapular?

Should we after this be astonished to see the eagerness of the faithful to take this blessed habit. We read in the registers of the confraternity the names of a multitude of people, of all ranks, and conditions, of the most respectable ecclesiastics, of Bishops, of Cardinals, Popes and Kings, which proves that of all the practices of piety existing among the faithful to honor the mother of God, there is no one more generally spread in every part of the christian world, than that of the confraternity of the holy Scapular, whose advantages we shall now detail.

Among the number of partial indulgences, there is

one of forty days for those who will recite seven Our Fathers, and seven Hail Marys each day.

One of one hundred days, for those who recite the office of the Blessed Virgin.

One of three hundred days, for those who will abstain from flesh meat on Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays.

One of five years for those who communicate once each month. Besides these special favors granted to those who wear this habit of the Blessed Virgin, this mother of mercies, revealed to Pope John XXII. many years after the death of St. Simon Stock, that they who should have happened to die wearing this holy livery, and who had still some sins to expiate in purgatory, should be delivered thence the first Saturday after their death.

The Bull of the Pope which relates this vision, and which has for this reason been called *La Bulle Sabbatine*, has been carefully examined by several congregations of Cardinals, approved after a close examination before an ecclesiastical tribunal, and confirmed by several Bulls of Popes who succeeded John XXII. in the Pontifical chair. Such are the advantages which are offered to those who wear the holy Scapular, but they can have no pretensions to enjoy them, unless they are faithful to fulfil the obligations required from all the true children of the Blessed Virgin, all true followers and servants of God.

TABULAR VIEW
OF THE
SOVEREIGNS OF EUROPE,
WITH THE TIMES OF THEIR ACCESSION.

A. D.

ENGLISH.

827 Egbert,
837 Ethelwolf,
857 Ethelbald and Ethelbert,
866 Ethelred.
871 Alfred the Great,
901 Edward the Elder,
925 Athelstan,
941 Edmund,
946 Edred,
955 Edwy,
958 Edgar,
975 Edward the Martyr,
979 Ethelred the II.
1016 Edmund Ironside,
1017 Canute the Great,
1035 Harold Harefoot,
1039 Hardicanute,
1041 Edward the Confessor,
1066 Harold II.
1066 William the Conqueror,
1087 William (Rufus) or II,
1100 Henry I.
1135 Stephen,

A. D.

- 1154 Henry II.
- 1189 Richard I.
- 1199 John,
- 1216 Henry III.
- 1272 Edward I.
- 1307 Edward II.
- 1327 Edward III.
- 1377 Richard II.
- 1399 Henry IV.
- 1413 Henry V.
- 1422 Henry VI.
- 1461 Edward IV.
- 1483 Edward V.
- 1483 Richard III.
- 1485 Henry VII.
- 1509 Henry VIII.
- 1547 Edward VI.
- 1553 Mary,
- 1558 Elizabeth,
- 1603 James I.
- 1625 Charles I.
- 1649 Commonwealth,
- 1660 Charles II.
- 1685 James II.
- 1689 William III. and Mary,
- 1701 Anne,
- 1714 George I.
- 1727 George II.
- 1760 George III.
- 1820 George IV.
- 1830 William IV.
- 1837 Victoria.

FRENCH.

- 987 Hugh Capet,
- 996 Robert,
- 1031 Henry I.
- 1059 Philip I.

A. D.

- 1106 Lewis IV.
- 1137 Lewis VII. the Younger.
- 1180 Philip II. Augusta,
- 1223 Lewis VIII.
- 1226 Lewis IX.
- 1271 Philip III. the Hardy,
- 1285 Philip IV. the Fair,
- 1314 Lewis X.
- 1316 John I.
- 1316 Philip V.
- 1322 Charles IV. the Fair,
- 1328 Philip VI. of Valois,
- 1350 John II.
- 1364 Charles V. the Wise,
- 1380 Charles VI. the well beloved,
- 1422 Charles VII. the Victorious,
Henry V. of England proclaimed,
- 1461 Lewis XI.
- 1482 Charles VIII.
- 1497 Lewis XII.
- 1514 Francis I.
- 1547 Henry II.
- 1559 Francis II.
- 1560 Charles IX.
- 1574 Henry III.
- 1589 Henry IV.
- 1610 Lewis XIII.
- 1643 Lewis XIV.
- 1715 Lewis XV.
- 1774 Lewis XVI.
- 1795 Republic,
- 1804 Napoleon Bonaparte,
- 1814 Lewis XVIII.
- 1824 Charles X.
- 1829 Louis Philippe.

GERMAN.

- 800 Charlemagne,
- 814 Lewis le Debonnaire,

A. D.

- 840 Lothario I.
- 855 Lewis II.
- 875 Charles II. the Bald,
- 878 Lewis III.
- 879 Charles III. the Fat,
- 888 Arnulf,
- 899 Lewis the Infant,
- 912 Conrad I.
- 919 Henry the Fowler,
- 936 Otho the Great,
- 973 Otho II.
- 983 Otho III.
- 1002 St. Henry II.
- 1024 Conrad II.
- 1039 Henry III.
- 1056 Henry IV.
- 1106 Henry V.
- 1125 Lothario II.
- 1139 Conrad III.
- 1151 Frederick I. (Barbarossa.)
- 1190 Henry VI.
- 1196 Philip of Suabia,
- 1208 Otto of Brunswick,
- 1216 Frederick II.
- 1250 Interregnum,
- 1273 Rodolphus of Hapsburg.
- 1291 Adolphus of Nassau,
- 1298 Albert I. of Austria,
- 1309 Henry VII.
- 1314 Lewis V. of Bavaria,
- 1347 Charles IV. of Luxemburg,
- 1378 Wincellaus of Bohemia,
- 1400 Robert, Palatine,
- 1410 Sigismund king of Bohemia,
- 1438 Albert II. of Austria,
- 1438 Frederick III.
- 1493 Maximilian I.
- 1519 Charles V.

A. D.

- 1556 Ferdinand I.
- 1564 Maximilian II. of Hungary,
- 1576 Rodolphus II.
- 1612 Matthias,
- 1619 Ferdinand II.
- 1637 Ferdinand III.
- 1656 Leopold I.
- 1705 Joseph I.
- 1711 Charles VI.
- 1740 Charles VII.
- 1745 Francis I. of Lorraine,
- 1765 Joseph II.
- 1790 Leopold II.
- 1792 Francis II. This Emperor occupied the imperial throne to the year 1806, when he abdicated and ended an Empire which had continued more than 1000 years.

SPANISH.

- 1474 Ferdinand and Isabella,
- 1504 Philip I.
- 1516 Charles I.
- 1559 Philip II.
- 1598 Philip III.
- 1621 Philip IV.
- 1665 Charles II.
- 1700 Philip V.
- 1724 Lewis,
- 1725 Philip, (reascends,)
- 1746 Ferdinand VI.
- 1759 Charles III.
- 1788 Charles IV.
- 1808 Resigned in favor of his son Ferdinand, since called Ferdinand VII.
- 1808 Joseph Bonaparte, appointed King, by Napoleon.

POPES.

- 33 St. Peter,
- 66 Linus,

A. D.

- 67 St. Clement,
- 77 St. Cletus,
- 82 Anacletus,
- 96 Evaristus,
- 108 Alexander I.
- 117 Sixtus I.
- 127 Telesphorus,
- 138 Hyginus,
- 150 Pius I.
- 153 Anicetus,
- 162 Soter,
- 172 Eleutherius,
- 185 Victor I.
- 196 Zephyrinus,
- 219 Calixtus I.
- 224 Urban I.
- 231 Pontianus,
- 235 Anterus,
- 236 Fabianus,
- 251 St. Cornelius,
- 254 Lucius I.
- 256 Stephen I.
- 258 Sixtus II.
- 259 Dionysius,
- 269 Felix I.
- 275 Eutychianus,
- 283 Caius Marcellinus,
- 296 Marcellinus,
- 304 Marcellus,
- 309 Eusebius,
- 311 Melchiades,
- 313 Sylvester,
- 335 Mark,
- 337 Julius I.
- 352 Liberius,
- 356 Felix III.
- 358 Felix III.
- 366 Damasus,
- 381 Syricius,

A. D.

- 399 Anastasius,
- 402 Innocent I.
- 417 Zosimus,
- 418 Boniface I.
- 423 Cœlestine,
- 432 Sixtus III.
- 450 Leo the Great,
- 461 Hilarius,
- 467 Simplicius,
- 483 Felix IV.
- 492 Gelasius,
- 496 Anastasius II.
- 498 Symmachus I.
- 514 Hormisdas,
- 523 John I.
- 526 Felix V.
- 529 Boniface II.
- 533 John II.
- 536 Agapetus,
- 536 Sylverias.
- 540 Vigilius,
- 555 Pelagius I.
- 558 John III.
- 572 Benedict I.
- 577 Pelagius II.
- 590 Gregory I. (the Great,)
- 605 Sabinianus,
- 606 Boniface IV.
- 614 Deodatus,
- 618 Boniface V.
- 625 Honorius I.
- 630 Severinus,
- 639 John IV.
- 641 Theodore,
- 648 Martin I.
- 655 Eugenius I.
- 656 Vitalianus,

A. D.

- 671 Adeodatus,
- 676 Dominus,
- 678 Agetho I.
- 678 Leo II.
- 684 Benedict II.]
- 685 John V.
- 686 Conon,
- 687 Sergius I.
- 701 John VI.
- 705 John VII.
- 707 Sisinius,
- 708 Constantine,
- 714 Gregory II.
- 731 Gregory III.
- 741 Zachary,
- 752 Stephen II. and III.
- 757 Paul I.
- 767 Stephen,
- 772 Adrian I.
- 797 Leo,
- 816 Stephen V.
- 817 Pascal I.
- 824 Eugene II.
- 827 Valentine,
- 827 Gregory IV.
- 844 Sergius II.
- 847 Leo IV.
- 855 Joan, hic Mulier,
- 858 Nicholas I.
- 867 Adrian II.
- 872 John VIII.
- 882 Marinus,
- 884 Adrian III.
- 885 Formosus,
- 897 Stephen VII.
- 897 John IX.
- 900 Benedict IV.
- 904 Leo V.

A. D.

- 905 Sergius III.
- 910 Anastasius III.
- 912 Laudon,
- 913 John X.
- 928 Leo VI.
- 929 Stephen VIII.
- 931 John XI.
- 936 Leo VII.
- 939 Stephen IX.
- 943 Marinus II.
- 946 Agapetus II.
- 956 John XII.
- 963 Leo VIII.
- 964 Benedict V.
- 965 John XIII.
- 972 Benedict VI.
- 975 Boniface VII.
- 984 Benedict VII.
- 984 John XIV.
- 986 John XV.
- 996 Gregory V.
- 999 Sylvester II. }
- 1003 John XVI.
- 1003 John XVII.
- 1004 John XVIII.
- 1009 Sergius IV.
- 1012 Benedict VIII.
- 1024 John XIX. or XX.
- 1033 Benedict IX.
- 1045 Gregory VI.
- 1046 Clement II.
- 1048 Damasus II.
- 1049 Leo IX.
- 1055 Victor II.
- 1057 Stephen X.
- 1058 Nicholas II.
- 1059 Benedict X.
- 1061 Alexander II

A. D.

- 1073 Gregory VII.
- 1086 Victor III.
- 1088 Urban II.
- 1099 Pascal II.
- 1118 Gelasius II.
- 1119 Calixtus II.
- 1124 Honorius II.
- 1130 Innocent II.
- 1143 Celestine II.
- 1144 Lucius II.
- 1145 Eugene III.
- 1153 Anastasius IV.
- 1154 Adrian IV.
- 1159 Alexander III.
- 1181 Lucius III.
- 1185 Urban III.
- 1187 Gregory VIII.
- 1188 Clement III.
- 1191 Celestinus III.
- 1198 Innocent III.
- 1216 Honorius III.
- 1226 Gregory IX.
- 1241 Celestine IV.
- 1253 Innocent IV.
- 1254 Alexander IV.
- 1261 Urban IV.
- 1264 Clement IV.
- 1268 Gregory X.
- 1276 Innocent V.
- 1276 Adrian V.
- 1276 John XXI.
- 1277 Nicholas III.
- 1280 Martin IV.
- 1285 Honorius IV.
- 1288 Nicholas IV.
- 1292 Celestine V.
- 1294 Boniface VIII.
- 1303 Benedict XI.

A. D.

- 1304 Clement V.
- 1314 John XXII.
- 1334 Benedict XII.
- 1342 Clement VI.
- 1352 Innocent VI.
- 1362 Urban V.
- 1372 Gregory XI.
- 1378 Urban VI.
- 1389 Boniface IX.
- 1394 Clement VII.
- 1394 Benedict XIII.
- 1404 Innocent VII.
- 1406 Gregory XII.
- 1409 Alexander V.
- 1410 John XXIII.
- 1417 Martin V.
- 1441 Eugene IV.
- 1447 Nicholas V.
- 1455 Calixtus III.
- 1458 Pius II.
- 1464 Paul II.
- 1471 Sixtus IV.
- 1484 Innocent VIII.
- 1492 Alexander VI.
- 1503 Pius III.
- 1503 Julius II.
- 1513 Leo X.
- 1522 Adrian VI.
- 1523 Clement VII.
- 1534 Paul III.
- 1549 Julius III.
- 1555 Marcellus II.
- 1555 Paul IV.
- 1559 Pius IV.
- 1563 Pius V.
- 1572 Gregory XIII.
- 1585 Sixtus V.
- 1590 Urban VII.
- 1590 Gregory XIV.

A. D.

- 1591 Innocent IX.
- 1592 Clement VIII.
- 1592 Leo XI.
- 1605 Paul V.
- 1621 Gregory XV.
- 1623 Urban VIII.
- 1644 Innocent X.
- 1655 Alexander VII.
- 1667 Clement IX.
- 1667 Clement X.
- 1676 Innocent XI.
- 1689 Alexander VIII.
- 1691 Innocent XII.
- 1700 Clement XI.
- 1721 Innocent XIII.
- 1724 Benedict XIII.
- 1730 Clement XII.
- 1740 Benedict XIV.
- 1758 Clement XIII.
- 1769 Clement XIV.
- 1776 Pius VI.
- 1799 Pius VII.
- 1823 Leo XII.



